arXiv:1412.3530v2 [math.OC] 17 May 2016

Optimal martingale transport between radially symmetric marginals in general dimensions

Tongseok Lim*

Mathematical Stochastics, TU Vienna
1040 Wien, Austria
e-mail: dongseok0213@gmail.com
lds@math.ubc.ca

Abstract: We determine the optimal structure of couplings for the *Martingale transport problem* between radially symmetric initial and terminal laws μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and show the uniqueness of optimizer. Here optimality means that such solutions will minimize the functional $\mathbb{E}|X - Y|^p$ where $0 < p \leq 1$, and the dimension d is arbitrary.

Primary 60G40, 60G42; secondary 49K30.
Keywords and phrases: Optimal Transport, Martingale, Monotonicity, Radial symmetry. .

1. Optimal transport problem and its variant

1.1. Optimal transport problem

This paper focuses on the structure of probability measures which solve certain optimization problems. The prototype is the optimal mass transport problem: for a given cost function $c : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and two Borel probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}^d$, we consider:

$$\text{Minimize } \text{cost}[\pi] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y)\, d\pi(x, y) \tag{1.1}$$

over all $\pi \in T(\mu, \nu)$, where $T(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of *mass Transport plans*, i.e. the set of probabilities π on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with marginals μ and ν on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We interpret the transport plan π as follows: for $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $\pi(A \times B)$ is then the amount of mass transported by the plan π from the resource domain A to the target range B. An equivalent probabilistic formulation is to consider the following problem:

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{P}}\, c(X, Y) \tag{1.2}$$

over all joint random variables $(X, Y) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with given laws $X \sim \mu$ and $Y \sim \nu$ respectively.

*The author greatfully acknowledges support from a doctoral graduate fellowship from the University of British Columbia, and from the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF) through grant Y782. ©2016 by the author.

In 1781, Gaspard Monge [30] formulated the following question that was relevant to his work in engineering: Given two sets U, V in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of equal volume, find the optimal volume-preserving map between them, where optimality is measured against the cost function $c(x, y)$ of transporting particle x to y. The optimal map should then minimize the total cost of redistributing the mass of U through V. Much later, Kantorovich generalized the Monge problem and proposed the above formulation.

In Monge's original problem, the cost was simply the Euclidean distance $c(x, y) = |x - y|$. Even for this seemingly simple case, it took two centuries before Sudakov [30], Evans [13], Gangbo-McCann [16], Ambrosio-Kirchheim-Pratelli [2, 3], Caffarelli-Feldman-McCann [10], Ma-Trudinger-Wang [25, 31, 32] and others showed rigourously that an optimal transport map exists.

More recently, a new direction emerged where the transport plans are assumed to be martingales. In the sequel, we shall describe the problem, its motivation, and our contributions.

1.2. Martingale optimal transport problem

Now we consider the following problem

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \text{Cost}[\pi] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} c(x, y)\, d\pi(x, y) \quad \text{over} \quad \pi \in MT(\mu, \nu) \tag{1.3}$$

where $\text{MT}(\mu, \nu)$ (Martingale Transport plan) is the set of joint probabilities on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ having μ and ν as its marginals, such that for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\pi \in \text{MT}(\mu, \nu)$, the disintegration π_x has its barycenter at x. In other words, for any convex function φ on $\mathbb{R}^d$, the disintegration π_x must satisfy

$$\varphi(x) \leq \int \varphi(y)\, d\pi_x(y). \tag{1.4}$$

We interprete the disintegration as conditional probability

$$d\pi_x(y) = \mathbb{P}(Y = y | X = x).$$

In other words, $d\pi(x, y) = d\pi_x(y) d\mu(x)$.

Equivalently, we study

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\text{P}}\, c(X, Y) \tag{1.5}$$

over all martingales (X, Y) on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ into $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ (i.e. $E[Y|X] = X$) with prescribed laws $X \sim \mu$ and $Y \sim \nu$.

It is shown in [29] that $\text{MT}(\mu, \nu)$ is nonempty if and only if μ and ν are in convex order.

Definition 1.1. *Measures μ and ν are said to be in convex order if*

1. *they have finite mass and finite first moments,*

2. for convex functions φ defined on $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\int \varphi \, d\mu \leq \int \varphi \, d\nu$.

In that case we will write $\mu \leq_c \nu$.

Note that measures μ, ν in $\mathbb{R}^1$ having the same finite mass and the same first moments are in convex order if and only if $\int (x-k)_+ \, d\mu(x) \leq \int (x-k)_+ \, d\nu(x)$ for all real k.

The problem originates in mathematical finance. Indeed, in the process of pricing financial options, the usual approach is to postulate a model and then calculate the price of an option according to the model. However, this assumption is not practical since all what we can observe in the market are the traded option prices and not any specific model. We are therefore led to ask what we could infer about the underlying model, if we can only know vanilla option prices. Mathematically speaking, we are interested in an underlying model (X, Y), where X is the (random) price of the options at the first date of maturity and Y is the price at the second date of maturity. If we know the call and put prices of many exercised prices for these dates of maturity, then we can infer the marginal distribution of the asset price (i.e. $X \sim \mu$ and $Y \sim \nu$). Since there can be many candidate martingales (X, Y) having the same marginals, we can then look at the ones where the two values Min $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{P}} \, c(X, Y)$ and Max $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{P}} \, c(X, Y)$ is achieved. This will give the lower (resp., upper) bound of the price of the option $c(X, Y)$.

It was D. Hobson who first recognized the importance of Skorokhod embeddings (see [22, 27]) in this "model-free" approach to finance and asset pricing. Since then, much related research has been done in this context, for example, by Beiglböck, Cox, Dolinsky, Galichon, Henry-Labordere, Hobson, Huesmann, Soner, Touzi and others [6], [8], [12], [15], [21], [22]. On the other hand, another long line of research on the general martingale transport problem has been made by Beiglböck, Henry-Labordere, Hobson, Juillet, Klimmek, Neuberger, Penkner, Touzi and others [5], [6], [7], [23], [24].

Note that in one dimension, the two problems are equivalent, i.e., one can always study martingales induced by stopped Brownian motion. This is not surprising since in $\mathbb{R}^1$, the class of convex functions is the same as the class of subharmonic functions.

But the class of convex functions becomes a strict subset of the class of subharmonic functions in dimension $d \geq 2$, and in this higher-dimensional case, the Skorokhod embedding problem is equivalent to the Subharmonic martingale transport problem (see [17] for the definition of the Subharmonic martingale problem and structural results which hold in arbitrary dimensions).

We note that the above cited papers are all concerned with dimension one. Mathematically, this means that the marginals μ, ν are probability measures on the real line, or the random variables X, Y have values in $\mathbb{R}^1$. Financially, this means that the option $c(X, Y)$ depends only on one stock process. It may not be hard to expect that the optimal martingale coupling problem (1.3) will be much more difficult when the option depends on arbitrarily many stock processes, simultaneously and nonlinearily. Nevertheless, the higher dimensional problem

looks very important, not only mathematically but also financially since many options in the real market indeed depend on many number of assets, e.g. every stock in the S&P 500 index.

It is therefore important to consider the higher dimensional case. In this paper, we show that the optimal martingale problem has a unique solution in case the marginals μ, ν are radially symmetric in arbitrary dimensions, which is satisfied by important distributions such as Gaussians. To the best of the author's knowledge, this is the first such result to be established in arbitrarily high dimensions, along with a companion paper [18] which deals with the general marginals case.

The main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that μ, ν are radially symmetric probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$ which are in convex order and $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$. Assume that either μ is absolutely continuous, or that there exists an open ball $B_r = \{x \,|\, |x| < r\}$ such that $\mu(B_r) = 1$ and $\nu(B_r) = 0$. Then there is a unique minimizer π for the problem (1.3) with respect to the cost $c(x, y) = |x-y|^p$ where $0 < p \leq 1$, and for μ almost every x, the disintegration π_x is concentrated on the one-dimensional subspace $L_x = \{ax \,|\, a \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Furthermore, if μ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure and $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$, then π_x is supported at two points on L_x.*

We note that [18] studied the optimal martingale transport problem in general dimensions as well, and they conjectured the following extremal property of minimizers.

Conjecture: *Consider the cost function $c(x, y) = |x - y|$ and assume that μ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and that $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$. If π is a martingale transport that minimizes (1.3), then for μ almost every x, the support of the disintegration* $\operatorname{supp} \pi_x$ *consists of $k + 1$ points that form the vertices of a k-dimensional polytope, where $k := k(x)$ is the dimension of the linear span of* $\operatorname{supp} \pi_x$. *Finally, the minimizing solution is unique.*

Therefore, Theorem 1.2 can be seen as an affirmative answer for the above conjecture when the marginals μ and ν are radially symmetric on $\mathbb{R}^d$, and in this case $k(x) \equiv 2$.

The organization of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the monotonicity principle [7, 35, 4] and establish the stability of the common marginal $\mu \wedge \nu$ under every minimizer of (1.3). In Section 3, we further apply the monotonicity to determine the structure of the minimizer in one dimension. Finally, in Section 4, we establish the deformation lemma and the main theorem which deals with arbitrary dimensions.

2. Monotonicity principle and stability of $\mu \wedge \nu$ under every minimizer

An important basic tool in optimal transport is the notion of *c-cyclical monotonicity*. A parallel statement was given in [7], then was generalized in [35], [4].

Definition 2.1. *Let φ be a finite measure supported on a finite set $H \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Let X_H be the orthogonal projection of H onto the first coordinate space $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then we say that ψ is a* competitor *of φ if ψ has the same marginals as φ and for each $x \in X_H$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y \, d\varphi(x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y \, d\psi(x,y)$.*

Lemma 2.2 (Monotonicity principle [7, 35, 4])**.** *Assume that μ, ν are probability measures in convex order and that $c : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Borel measurable cost function. Assume that $\pi \in MT(\mu,\nu)$ is an optimal martingale transport plan which leads to finite cost. Then there exists a Borel set $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\pi(\Gamma) = 1$ such that the following monotonicity principle holds:*
If φ is a finite measure on a finite set $H \subseteq \Gamma$, then for every competitor ψ of φ, we have

$$\int c \, d\varphi \leq \int c \, d\psi.$$

The meaning of the monotonicity principle is clear: $\mathrm{supp}(\varphi) \subseteq \Gamma$ means that φ is a "subplan" of the full transport plan π, and the definition of competitor means that if we change the subplan φ to ψ, then the martingale structure of π is not disrupted. Now if we have $\int c \, d\varphi > \int c \, d\psi$, then we may modify π to have ψ as its subplan, achieving less cost, therefore the current plan π is not a minimizer. For more details and proofs, see [7] or [35].

The following notations are introduced in [7] and we use them in this paper:

For a set $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $X_\Gamma := \mathrm{proj}_X \Gamma$, $Y_\Gamma := \mathrm{proj}_Y \Gamma$, i.e. X_Γ is the projection of Γ on the first coordinate space $\mathbb{R}^d$, and Y_Γ on the second. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we let $\Gamma_x = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid (x,y) \in \Gamma\}$.

Now as an application of the monotonicity principle, we prove the stability of $\mu \wedge \nu$ under every optimal martingale transport. [7] discusses the following theorem in one-dimensional setup with $p = 1$. We prove it here in general dimension with every $0 < p \leq 1$. Note that radial symmetry of μ, ν is not assumed.

Theorem 2.3. *Let π be any minimizer of the problem (1.3) with cost $c(x,y) = |x-y|^p$, $0 < p \leq 1$. Then under π the common mass $\mu \wedge \nu$ stays put, in the sense that if we define $D : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ by $D(x) = (x,x)$, then the push-forward measure of $\mu \wedge \nu$ by the map D is dominated by π, i.e. $D_\#(\mu \wedge \nu) \leq \pi$.*

Proof. Suppose that the theorem is false. Then there exists a minimizer π such that $D_\#(\mu \wedge \nu) \not\leq \pi$. Let Γ be a monotone concentration set of π as in Lemma 2.2 and denote $(\pi_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ as its integration. Since $D_\#(\mu \wedge \nu) \not\leq \pi$, we can find a

point $x \in \mathrm{supp}(\mu \wedge \nu)$ such that π_x is not a Dirac mass δ_x and $(z, x) \in \Gamma$ for some $z \neq x$. Then as $\pi_x(\Gamma_x) = 1$, we can find a probability measure ψ_x such that $\psi_x \neq \delta_x$, ψ_x is supported on a finite subset of Γ_x, and ψ_x has its barycenter at x.

Now for every $0 < p \leq 1$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $|x-y|^p+|z-x|^p \geq |y-z|^p$, hence

$$\int |x - y|^p d\psi_x(y) + |z - x|^p \geq \int |y - z|^p d\psi_x(y). \tag{2.1}$$

But the inequality is strict whenever $\psi_x \neq \delta_x$ and ψ_x has barycenter at x, a contradiction to the fact that Γ is monotone. Therefore, the theorem holds and every minimizer π makes the common mass $\mu \wedge \nu$ stay put. □

Remark 2.4. By the theorem, we can reduce the problem between disjoint marginals $\bar{\mu} := \mu - \mu \wedge \nu$ and $\bar{\nu} := \nu - \mu \wedge \nu$. Thus, from now on we will always assume that $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$, and therefore, for any minimizer $\pi \in MT(\mu, \nu)$, we have a monotone set Γ such that $\pi(\Gamma) = 1$ and $\Gamma \cap \Delta = \emptyset$, where $\Delta := \{(x, x) \,|\, x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$.

3. Structure of optimal martingale transport in one dimension

In this section, we study the problem (1.3) in one dimension, i.e. the marginals μ, ν are defined on the real line $\mathbb{R}$. We will consider the cost function $c(x, y) = |x - y|^p$ with $0 < p \leq 1$ and will determine the structure of optimal coupling. In this section, we do not assume the symmetry of marginals μ, ν with respect to the origin. Recall that we can assume $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$. Finally, we will say that μ is continuous if μ does not assign positive measure at any point: $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

The following theorem for the 1-dimensional case was shown in [7] when $p = 1$, and we extend it for every $0 < p \leq 1$.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$, μ is continuous and $c(x, y) = |x - y|^p$ for some $0 < p \leq 1$. Let π be a minimizer for the problem (1.3) with $d = 1$. Then, there exists a monotone set Γ such that $\pi(\Gamma) = 1$ and for every $x \in X_\Gamma$, we have $|\Gamma_x| = 2$. Hence if we define two functions $S : X_\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ and $T : X_\Gamma \to \mathbb{R}$ by $\Gamma_x = \{S(x), T(x)\}$ and $S(x) < x < T(x)$, then π is concentrated on $graph(S) \cup graph(T)$. Therefore, the minimizer is unique.*

Proof. Let Γ be any monotone concentration set of π and suppose $(x, y^-), (x, y^+), (x', y') \in \Gamma$, with $y^- < y' < y^+$. Then we claim that neither $y^- < x' < x \leq y'$ nor $y' \leq x < x' < y^+$ is possible. To prove the claim, suppose $y^- < x' < x \leq y'$ and let $0 < t < 1$ be such that $ty^- + (1 - t)y^+ = y'$. Now consider the function

$$G(z) = t|z - y^-|^p + (1 - t)|z - y^+|^p - |z - y'|^p.$$

If $y^- < z < y'$, this becomes

$$G(z) = t(z - y^-)^p + (1-t)(y^+ - z)^p - (y' - z)^p.$$

By taking derivative, we get

$$G'(z) = p[t(z - y^-)^{p-1} - (1-t)(y^+ - z)^{p-1} + (y' - z)^{p-1}].$$

We observe

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{If } 0 < p < 1, \quad (y' - z)^{p-1} > (y^+ - z)^{p-1} \quad \text{hence} \quad G'(z) > 0. \\ &\text{If} \qquad p = 1, \quad G'(z) = t - (1-t) + 1 = 2t > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for $y^- < x' < x \le y'$, we have $G(x') < G(x)$. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} &t(x' - y^-)^p + (1-t)(y^+ - x')^p + |y' - x|^p \\ &< t(x - y^-)^p + (1-t)(y^+ - x)^p + |y' - x'|^p. \end{aligned}$$

This means that if we define a measure φ by $\varphi = t\delta_{(x,y^-)} + (1-t)\delta_{(x,y^+)} + \delta_{(x',y')}$, then we have a cost-efficient competitor ψ by $\psi = t\delta_{(x',y^-)} + (1-t)\delta_{(x',y^+)} + \delta_{(x,y')}$. Note that ψ satisfies the assumption to be a competitor of φ. Hence by Lemma 2.2, $(x, y^-), (x, y^+), (x', y') \in \Gamma$ with $y^- < y' < y^+$ and $y^- < x' < x \le y'$ cannot occur. The case $y' \le x < x' < y^+$ cannot occur by similar reasoning.

Now we follow the argument in [7]: Suppose the set $A := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |\Gamma_x| \ge 3\}$ is uncountable. ($|\Gamma_x|$ is the cardinality of the set Γ_x.) Then we will have $(x, y^-), (x, y^+), (x, y) \in \Gamma$, with $y^- < x < y < y^+$ or $y^- < y < x < y^+$ (Recall that $\Gamma \cap \Delta = \emptyset$, where $\Delta := \{(x, x) \,|\, x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, since $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$). Assume the first case. Then the Lemma 3.2 in [7] shows that any given $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $(x', y') \in \Gamma$ with $x - \varepsilon < x' < x$ and $|y' - y| < \varepsilon$ by the uncountability of A. Then for small ε we have the first forbidden case, and similarly if $y^- < y < x < y^+$ then we have $(x', y') \in \Gamma$ with $x < x' < x + \varepsilon$ and $|y' - y| < \varepsilon$, the second forbidden case, a contradiction. Hence A must be countable, therefore by continuity of μ, A is negligible.

Uniqueness follows by usual argument, namely, if π_1 and π_2 are optimal solutions realized by (S_1, T_1) and (S_2, T_2) respectively, then the average $\frac{\pi_1 + \pi_2}{2}$ is also optimal and hence it must also be realized by two functions (S, T). This implies that $S_1(x) = S_2(x)$ and $T_1(x) = T_2(x)$ for μ a.e. x, yielding uniqueness. □

In fact, we can say more on the structure of optimal martingale. Note that in the following lemma, the continuity of μ is not assumed.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $I := (a, b)$ be an open interval and suppose $\nu(I) = 0$. Let $c(x, y) = |x - y|^p$ for some $0 < p \le 1$ and let π be a minimizer for the problem (1.3). Denote $(\pi_x)_x$ be its disintegration and if $x \in I$, then denote π_x^+ as the restriction of π_x on $[b, \infty)$ and π_x^- as the restriction of π_x on $(-\infty, a]$.*

Then $x, x' \in I$ and $x < x'$ implies

$$\sup(\mathrm{supp}(\pi_{x'}^+)) \le \inf(\mathrm{supp}(\pi_x^+)) \quad \textit{and} \quad \sup(\mathrm{supp}(\pi_{x'}^-)) \le \inf(\mathrm{supp}(\pi_x^-)).$$

In other words, the set-valued functions $x \mapsto \mathrm{supp}(\pi_x^+)$ *and* $x \mapsto \mathrm{supp}(\pi_x^-)$ *decrease on* I.

Proof. Let Γ be a monotone concentration set of π with $Y_\Gamma \cap I = \emptyset$. If $x, x' \in I \cap X_\Gamma$ and $x < x'$, then we claim that $\sup(\Gamma_{x'}^+) \le \inf(\Gamma_x^+)$, where $\Gamma_x^+ := \Gamma_x \cap [b, \infty)$. If not, then we can find $y' > y \ge b$ such that $(x, y), (x', y') \in \Gamma$. As π is a martingale, we can also find $y'' \le a$ with $(x', y'') \in \Gamma$. Then the configuration $(x, y), (x', y'), (x', y'') \in \Gamma$ is forbidden by the proof of Theorem 3.1, a contradiction. As $\pi_x(\Gamma_x) = 1$ for every $x \in X_\Gamma$, π_x^+ has its full mass on Γ_x^+, hence $\sup(\mathrm{supp}(\pi_{x'}^+)) \le \inf(\mathrm{supp}(\pi_x^+))$. The other case $\sup(\mathrm{supp}(\pi_{x'}^-)) \le \inf(\mathrm{supp}(\pi_x^-))$ can be proved similarly. □

We may say the above result as "local decreasing property", as the function $x \mapsto \mathrm{supp}(\pi_x^+)$ and $x \mapsto \mathrm{supp}(\pi_x^-)$ decrease locally, i.e. on an open interval I whenever $\nu(I) = 0$. Thus if we make the following assumption, we will have the global decreasing property for any optimal martingale transport.
(*Separation Assumption*) There is an open interval I such that

$$\mu(I) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(I) = 0.$$

For example, two Gaussian measures μ, ν in convex order will satisfy this assumption, after $\mu \wedge \nu$ is subtracted from each marginal. Now we observe that the global decreasing property also yields the uniqueness of optimal solution, without assuming the continuity of μ.

Theorem 3.3. *Under the separation assumption, a solution for the problem* (1.3) *with* $c(x, y) = |x - y|^p$ *for some* $0 < p \le 1$ *is unique. Moreover, the optimal solution is identical for all* $0 < p \le 1$.

Proof. The proof will explain the following statement:

The decreasing property uniquely determines the martingale $\pi \in \mathrm{MT}(\mu, \nu)$.

Let $0 < p \le 1$ be fixed and let π be a minimizer. Then the separation assumption yields that $(\pi_x)_{x \in I}$ decreases on $I = (a, b)$, as shown in Lemma 3.2. By the decreasing property, π must take the mass of μ from the left of the domain (a, b) and transport it to fill out the ν^+ (ν restricted on $[b, \infty)$) and ν^- (ν restricted on $(-\infty, a]$) from the right in a martingale way. When μ, ν are continuous, this is described by the following equations with functions $S(x) \in (-\infty, a]$ and $T(x) \in [b, \infty)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\big((a, x]\big) &= \nu^-\big((S(x), a]\big) + \nu^+\big((T(x), \infty)\big), \\ \int_a^x t \, d\mu(t) &= \int_{S(x)}^a t \, d\nu^-(t) + \int_{T(x)}^\infty t \, d\nu^+(t). \end{aligned}$$

The first equation says the preservation of mass, and the second says the preservation of barycenter. In the general case of μ, ν, with functions $0 \le \lambda^-(x), \lambda^+(x) \le 1$, note that the above equations will be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\left((a,x]\right) &= \lambda^-(x)\,\nu^-\big(S(x)\big) + \nu^-\left((S(x),a]\right)\\ &\quad + \lambda^+(x)\,\nu^+\big(T(x)\big) + \nu^+\left((T(x),\infty)\right),\\ \int_{(a,x]} t\,d\mu(t) &= S(x)\,\lambda^-(x)\,\nu^-\big(S(x)\big) + \int_{(S(x),a]} t\,d\nu^-(t)\\ &\quad + T(x)\,\lambda^+(x)\,\nu^+\big(T(x)\big) + \int_{(T(x),\infty)} t\,d\nu^+(t).\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $S(x), T(x), \lambda^-(x), \lambda^+(x)$ are uniquely determined if $S(x), T(x)$ are chosen as the largest numbers which satisfy the above equations. Furthermore, it is clear that these equations uniquely determine the martingale coupling $\pi \in MT(\mu,\nu)$. Finally, the above equations are derived only from the decreasing property of π and they do not depend on p, therefore the theorem follows. □

In particular if we assume the symmetry of μ, ν with respect to the origin:

Corollary 3.4. *If μ, ν are symmetric with respect to the origin, then the unique coupling in Theorem 3.1 or 3.3 is also symmetric.*

Proof. We can prove it directly, or we let σ be the optimal coupling in Theorem 3.1 or 3.3, and let $\tau = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma + \sigma')$ be a symmetrization of σ, where σ' is the reflection of σ with respect to the origin. Then τ is also optimal, so by uniqueness, $\sigma = \tau$. □

4. Structure of optimal martingale transport in higher dimensions

We have studied the structure of the martingale transport in one dimension which minimizes $\mathbb{E}\,|X - Y|^p$ where $0 < p \leq 1$, and in particular have shown its uniqueness either when μ is continuous or when the separation assumption holds. In this section, we will introduce the notion of symmetrization of a transport plan, and then will present a variational calculus which will lead the higher dimensional problem under radially symmetric marginals into the one-dimensional situation.

4.1. Symmetrization of transport plans and the R-equivalence relation

In this section, we introduce the notion of symmetrization of transport plans (i.e. probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$), and the notion of R-equivalence on the space of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$. These ideas will play a crucial role for the Theorem 1.2. Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be the group of all $d \times d$ real orthonormal matrices, on which the Haar measure $\mathcal{H}$ is defined. Given $M \in \mathfrak{M}$ and a transport plan π, we define $M\pi$ as the following: for Borel sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we define

$$(M\pi)(A \times B) = \pi(M(A) \times M(B)).$$

Clearly, $M\pi$ is also a transport plan and the above equation uniquely determines $M\pi$. Now we introduce the symmetrization operator which acts on the space of transport plans.

Definition 4.1. *We define the symmetrization operator $\mathcal{S}$ on a transport plan π as: for each $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$(\mathcal{S}\pi)(D) = \int_{M\in\mathfrak{M}} (M\pi)(D)\, d\mathcal{H}(M).$$

For better understanding of the above definition, we decompose the operator $\mathcal{S}$ into two operators, namely the L- and R- operators.

Definition 4.2. *Let L be a one-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let ψ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. We say that ψ is L-symmetric if it is symmetric with respect to L, i.e. for any Borel set B and any orthonormal matrix M which fixes L, we have $\psi(B) = \psi(M(B))$.*

We say that the probability measures φ and ψ are L-equivalent if $\varphi(B) = \psi(B)$ for every $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ which is symmetric with respect to L, i.e. $x \in B$ implies $z \in B$ for every z with $dist(z, L) = dist(x, L)$ and $x - z \perp L$. Then, we define $L(\psi)$ to be the unique L-symmetric measure that is L-equivalent to ψ.

Now we turn to the notion of R- symmetrization. Let $S_r = \{x \,|\, |x| = r\}$ be the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with radius r, let ζ be a probability measure on S_r, and let $(\pi_x)_{x\in S_r}$ be a set of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$ defined for ζ-a.e. $x \in S_r$. We can view this as a mass transport plan π with initial mass ζ, by seeing π_x as its disintegration. We may denote this as $\pi = (\zeta, \pi_x)$.

Now fix a vector $w \in S_r$, and let $(M_x)_{x\in S_r}$ be a choice of orthonormal matrices with the property $M_x(x) = w$. For $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $T_u(z) = z + u$ be translations. Finally, let L_x be the one-dimensional subspace spanned by $x \neq 0$.

Now consider the following probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\sigma(\cdot) := \int_{x\in S_r} \left(M_x \circ T_{-x} \circ L_x(\pi_x)\right)(\cdot)\, d\zeta(x).$$

Note that σ does not depend on the choice of $(M_x)_{x\in S_r}$, due to the presence of the operator L_x in the definition. Now we define the R-symmetrization operator acting on the transport plan $\pi = (\zeta, \pi_x)$.

Definition 4.3. *The R-symmetrization operator is defined by*

$$R[\pi] = R[(\zeta, \pi_x)] = (U, \sigma_x)$$

where $\sigma_x = (T_x \circ M_x^{-1})(\sigma)$ and U is the uniform probability measure on S_r.

Thus, σ is an average of appropriately translated and rotated π_x's with weight ζ, and R-symmetrization operator uniformly pushes σ back on S. Now for any transport plan $\pi = (\mu, \pi_x)$ with general initial distribution μ on $\mathbb{R}^d$, one can similarly apply the R-symmetrization, by applying the above R-symmetrization

on each disintegration of μ along the spherical layers S_r for every $r \geq 0$. This is what the $\mathcal{S}$-symmetrization operator does.

Finally, we introduce the notion of R-equivalence on the space of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition 4.4. *Probability measures φ and ψ are called R-equivalent if they contain the same mass on any annulus, i.e. for any $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ and any $A_B := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \,|\, |x| \in B\}$, we have $\varphi(A_B) = \psi(A_B)$.*

Next, we will apply the symmetrization ideas to study the structure of optimal martingale transport in higher dimensions, when the marginals are radially symmetric.

4.2. Deformation lemma and main theorem

In this section, we will present a deformation lemma which will allow martingale transport problem under radial marginals to be reduced to the problem on the one-dimensional subspaces, where we can apply the results in the previous section.

Lemma 4.5 (Deformation Lemma)**.** *Consider the cost function of the form $c(x, y) = h(|x - y|)$ and let L_x be the one-dimensional subspace spanned by x, $x \neq 0$. Let φ be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with barycenter at x and assume that φ is not supported on L_x. Suppose that $r \mapsto h'(r)/r$ is strictly decreasing for $r > 0$. Then, there exists a probability measure ψ with barycenter at x, supported on L_x and is R- equivalent to φ, such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(|x - y|)\, d\varphi(y) > \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(|x - y|)\, d\psi(y). \tag{4.1}$$

For example, $h(r) = r^p$, $0 < p < 2$, or $h(r) = -r^p$, $p > 2$, satisfies the assumption of the lemma.

Proof. We can assume that φ is L_x-symmetric, as the operation $\varphi \mapsto L(\varphi)$ does not change the cost $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(|x - y|)\, d\varphi(y)$ and $\varphi \cong_R L(\varphi)$. Thus, it will be sufficient to consider the two-dimensional case $d = 2$, as we will see. Now we will explain how to deform φ to obtain ψ in the lemma.

For this, let us consider the family of probability measures $\psi(t)$ supported on the four points $z_n^1(t), z_n^2(t), z_s^1(t), z_s^2(t)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$, where $0 \leq t \leq 1$ is a parameter. We will observe that the cost of $\psi(t)$ strictly decreases as t increases, which will be the desired deformation process.

To begin, without loss of generality let the barycenter x be a point in $\mathbb{R}^2$, $x = (0, b), b \neq 0$. Let $z^1, z^2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $|z^1| = |z^2| = r > 0$ and let $z^1 = (a, z)$, $z^2 = (-a, z)$. Now for $0 \leq t \leq 1$, let $z_n(t) = z + t(r - z)$, $z_s(t) = z - t(r + z)$, and let

$$\begin{aligned} z_n^1(t) &= \big(\sqrt{r^2 - (z_n(t))^2}, z_n(t)\big), \quad z_n^2(t) = \big(-\sqrt{r^2 - (z_n(t))^2}, z_n(t)\big), \\ z_s^1(t) &= \big(\sqrt{r^2 - (z_s(t))^2}, z_s(t)\big), \quad z_s^2(t) = \big(-\sqrt{r^2 - (z_s(t))^2}, z_s(t)\big). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the four points $z_n^1(t), z_n^2(t), z_s^1(t), z_s^2(t)$ are on the circle of center 0 and radius r, and they are symmetrically located with respect to the vertical axis. Now define the probability measure $\psi(t)$ and its transportation cost

$$\psi(t) = \frac{r+z}{4r}\delta_{z_n^1(t)} + \frac{r+z}{4r}\delta_{z_n^2(t)} + \frac{r-z}{4r}\delta_{z_s^1(t)} + \frac{r-z}{4r}\delta_{z_s^2(t)},$$
$$C(t) = \frac{r+z}{2r}h(||z_n^1(t) - x||) + \frac{r-z}{2r}h(||z_s^1(t) - x||).$$

Thus, $C(t)$ is the cost of transporting the point mass δ_x to $\psi(t)$. Note that $\psi(0) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{(-a,z)} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{(a,z)}$ and $\psi(1) = \frac{r+z}{2r}\delta_{(0,r)} + \frac{r-z}{2r}\delta_{(0,-r)}$, so $\psi(t)$ is a continuous deformation from $\psi(0)$ to $\psi(1)$ along the circle of radius r. Now, observe that for all $0 \le t \le 1$, the barycenter of $\psi(t)$ is fixed at $(0, z)$ and they are obviously R-equivalent. We will show $C'(t) < 0$ if $h'(r)/r$ is strictly decreasing for $r > 0$. To see this, we compute

$$C'(t) = \left(\frac{r+z}{2r}\right)\frac{h'(||z_n^1(t) - x||)}{||z_n^1(t) - x||)}\big\langle z_n^1(t) - x, \frac{d}{dt}\big(z_n^1(t)\big)\big\rangle + \left(\frac{r-z}{2r}\right)\frac{h'(||z_s^1(t) - x||)}{||z_s^1(t) - x||)}\big\langle z_s^1(t) - x, \frac{d}{dt}\big(z_s^1(t)\big)\big\rangle$$

where $\langle , \rangle$ is the inner product. Note $\big\langle z_n^1(t), \frac{d}{dt}\big(z_n^1(t)\big)\big\rangle = \big\langle z_s^1(t), \frac{d}{dt}\big(z_s^1(t)\big)\big\rangle = 0$, and

$$\big\langle x, \frac{d}{dt}\big(z_n^1(t)\big)\big\rangle = b(r-z), \quad \big\langle x, \frac{d}{dt}\big(z_s^1(t)\big)\big\rangle = -b(r+z), \quad \text{hence}$$
$$C'(t) = \left(\frac{b(r+z)(r-z)}{2r}\right)\left[\frac{h'(||z_s^1(t) - x||)}{||z_s^1(t) - x||)} - \frac{h'(||z_n^1(t) - x||)}{||z_n^1(t) - x||)}\right].$$

Now we compute

$$||z_n^1(t) - x||^2 = r^2 + b^2 - 2b\, z_n(t) = r^2 + b^2 - 2b(z + t(r-z))$$
$$||z_s^1(t) - x||^2 = r^2 + b^2 - 2b\, z_s(t) = r^2 + b^2 - 2b(z - t(r+z))$$
$$||z_n^1(t) - x||^2 - ||z_s^1(t) - x||^2 = -4brt.$$

Hence, we see that

$$||z_n^1(t) - x|| < ||z_s^1(t) - x|| \quad \text{if} \quad b > 0$$
$$||z_n^1(t) - x|| > ||z_s^1(t) - x|| \quad \text{if} \quad b < 0.$$

Thus in any case $C'(t) < 0$. Hence, $C(0) > C(1)$ and note that $\psi(1)$ is supported on the line L_x.

Now we return to the general case and assume that φ is L_x-symmetric (if not, consider $L_x(\varphi)$) but not supported on L_x. Consider a pair of points z^1, z^2 in $\mathbb{R}^d$ that are symmetric with respect to L_x, i.e. $|z^1| = |z^2| = r$, $\langle x, z^1 - z^2\rangle = 0$ and $\frac{z^1+z^2}{2} \in L_x$. Now by L_x-symmetry of φ, $d\varphi(z^1) = d\varphi(z^2)$, so we can perform the continuous deformation on the infinitesimal measure $d\varphi(z^1)\delta_{z_1} +$

$d\varphi(z^2)\delta_{z_2}$ along a great circle of radius r. By the above computation the cost is strictly decreasing. Hence, after performing the deformation to all such pair of symmetric points z^1, z^2 in the support of φ, we obtain ψ which is supported on the ray L_x, and we have shown that (4.1) holds. □

Finally, we apply the symmetrization arguments in conjunction with the variational lemma to conclude the following theorem. Recall that without loss of generality we can assume $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$, by Remark 2.4.

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose that $\mu \wedge \nu = 0$, $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$ and μ, ν are radially symmetric probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$ which are in convex order. Assume that either μ is absolutely continuous, or that there exists an open ball $B_r = \{x \,|\, |x| < r\}$ such that $\mu(B_r) = 1$ and $\nu(B_r) = 0$. Then there is a unique minimizer π for the problem (1.3) with respect to the cost $c(x, y) = |x-y|^p$, where $0 < p \leq 1$. Furthermore, for each x, the disintegration π_x is concentrated on the one-dimensional subspace L_x.*

Proof. Let π be a minimizer. First of all, we claim that for μ a.e. x, the disintegration π_x is concentrated on the line L_x. If not, then we apply the deformation lemma 4.5 for each π_x and get a competitor ψ_x, so that we get another martingale $\psi = (\mu, \psi_x)$ having ψ_x as its disintegrations. Then Lemma 4.5 tells us that $\text{cost}(\pi) > \text{cost}(\psi)$, but note that ψ is not necessarily be in $\text{MT}(\mu, \nu)$. However, since π_x and ψ_x are R-equivalent, if we apply the $\mathcal{S}$-symmetrization to the martingale ψ, then $\mathcal{S}\psi$ is in $\text{MT}(\mu, \nu)$, by radial symmetry of μ and ν. Now $\text{cost}(\pi) > \text{cost}(\psi) = \text{cost}(\mathcal{S}\psi)$, a contradiction. Hence the claim is true for every minimizer $\pi \in \text{MT}(\mu, \nu)$. This implies that the problem (1.3) is decomposed to the problem on each one-dimensional subspace, which respect to the induced marginals along each subspace. Then the corollary 3.4 says that the solution for each reduced problem is unique, yielding uniqueness for the whole problem. □

Remark 4.7. When μ and ν are defined by density functions f and g on $\mathbb{R}^d$, then the induced marginals along one-dimensional subspace have the corresponding density functions $f_0(r) = f(r)|r|^{d-1}$ and $g_0(r) = g(r)|r|^{d-1}$, $-\infty < r < \infty$, by the radial symmetry of μ and ν. Let us check that f_0 and g_0 are in convex order.

By radial symmetry of f and g, f_0 and g_0 have the same mass and the same barycenter 0. Thus to check the convex order, we only need to show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (r-k)_+ f_0(r)dr \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} (r-k)_+ g_0(r)dr$$

for all real k. Let $s_k(r) = (r-k)_+$ and $h_k(r) = \frac{1}{2}(s_k(r) + s_k(-r))$. Now let $H(x) = h_k(|x|)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then H is a radially symmetric convex function, hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(x)f(x)dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(x)g(x)dx$$

and if we let C be the surface area of the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then it is clear that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} H(x)f(x)dx = C\int_{\mathbb{R}} h_k(r)f(r)|r|^{d-1}dr = C\int_{\mathbb{R}} (r-k)_+ f_0(r)\,dr.$$

References

[1] B. Acciaio, M. Beiglböck, F. Penkner, and W. Schachermayer. A model-free version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing and the super-replication theorem. *Mathematical Finance.*, DOI: 10.1111/mafi.12060, (2013).

[2] L. Ambrosio, B. Kirchheim, and A. Pratelli. Existence of optimal transport maps for crystalline norms. *Duke Math. J.*, Volume 125, Number 2 (2004), 207-241.

[3] L. Ambrosio and A. Pratelli. Existence and stability results in the L^1 theory of optimal transportation. *Optimal transportation and applications. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.*, Volume 1813 of the series Lecture Notes in Mathematics (2003) 123-160.

[4] M. Beiglböck and C. Griessler. An optimality principle with applications in optimal transport. http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.7054, (2014).

[5] M. Beiglböck, P. Henry-Labordere, and F. Penkner. Model-independent bounds for option prices: a mass transport approach. *Finance and Stochastics.*, 17 (2013) 477-501.

[6] M. Beiglböck, P. Henry-Labordere, and N. Touzi. Monotone martingale transport plans and Skorohod Embedding. Preprint (2015).

[7] M. Beiglböck and N. Juillet. On a problem of optimal transport under marginal martingale constraints. *Ann. Probab.*, Volume 44, Number 1 (2016), 42-106.

[8] M. Beiglböck, A.M.G. Cox, and M. Huesmann. Optimal transport and Skorokhod embedding. http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.3656, (2014).

[9] Y. Brenier. Polar factorization and monotone rearrangement of vector-valued functions. *Communications on pure and applied mathematics*, Volume 44, Issue 4 (1991) 375-417.

[10] L.A. Caffarelli, M. Feldman, and R. J. McCann. Constructing optimal maps for Monge's transport problem as a limit of strictly convex costs. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 15 (2002), 1-26

[11] G. Choquet. Forme abstraite du théorème de capacitabilité. *Ann. Inst. Fourier. Grenoble*, 9 (1959) 83–89.

[12] Y. Dolinsky and H.M. Soner. Martingale optimal transport and robust hedging in continuous time. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields.*, 160 (2014) 391-427.

[13] L.C. Evans. Partial differential equations and Monge-Kantorovich mass transfer. *Current Developments in Mathematics.*, 1997, International Press.

[14] P. Fischer and J. A. R. Holbrook. Balayage defined by the nonnegative convex functions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 79(3) (1980) 445-448.

[15] A. Galichon, P. Henry-Labordere, and N. Touzi. A Stochastic Control Approach to No-Arbitrage Bounds Given Marginals, with an Application to Lookback Options. *Annals of Applied Probability.*, Volume 24, Number 1 (2014) 312-336.

[16] W. Gangbo and R.J. McCann. The geometry of optimal transportation. *Acta Math.*, Volume 177, Issue 2 (1996) 113-161.

[17] N. Ghoussoub, Y-H. Kim, and T. Lim. Optimal Skorokhod Embedding between radially symmetric marginals in general dimensions. Preprint (2016).
[18] N. Ghoussoub, Y-H. Kim, and T. Lim. Structure of optimal martingale transport in general dimensions. http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.01806, (2015).
[19] G. Guo, X. Tan, and N. Touzi. Optimal Skorokhod embedding under finitely-many marginal constraints. http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.04063, (2015).
[20] F. Hirsch, C. Profeta, B. Roynette, and M. Yor. *Peacocks and associated martingales, with explicit constructions*, volume 3 of *Bocconi & Springer Series*. Springer, Milan (2011).
[21] D. Hobson. Robust hedging of the lookback option. *Finance and Stochastics.*, 2 (1998) 329-347.
[22] D. Hobson. The Skorokhod embedding problem and model-independent bounds for option prices. In *Paris-Princeton Lectures on Mathematical Finance 2010*, volume 2003 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, Springer, Berlin (2011) 267-318.
[23] D. Hobson and M. Klimmek. Robust price bounds for the forward starting straddle. *Finance and Stochastics.*, Volume 19, Issue 1 (2014) 189-214.
[24] D. Hobson and A. Neuberger. Robust bounds for forward start options. *Mathematical Finance.*, Volume 22, Issue 1 (2012) 31-56.
[25] X. N. Ma, N. S. Trudinger, and X. J. Wang. Regularity of potential functions of the optimal transportation problem. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 177 (2005), no. 2, 151-183.
[26] G. Monge. Mémoire sur la théorie des déblais et des remblais. *Histoire de l'académie Royale des Sciences de Paris*, (1781).
[27] J. Obłój. The Skorokhod embedding problem and its offspring. *Probab. Surveys*, Volume 1 (2004), 321-392.
[28] R.T. Rockafellar. Characterization of the subdifferentials of convex functions. *Pacific J. Math*, 17 (1966) 497-510.
[29] V. Strassen. The existence of probability measures with given marginals. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 36 (1965) 423-439.
[30] V. N. Sudakov. Geometric problems in the theory of infinite-dimensional probability distributions. *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.*, 141 (1979), 1-178.
[31] N. S. Trudinger and X. J. Wang. On the second boundary value problem for Monge-Ampère type equations and optimal transportation. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.*, (5), 8 (2009), no. 1, 143-174.
[32] N. S. Trudinger and X. J. Wang. On strict convexity and continuous differentiability of potential functions in optimal transportation. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 192 (2009), no. 3, 403-418.
[33] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, Volume 58, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, (2003).
[34] C. Villani. *Optimal Transport. Old and New*, Vol. 338, *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, (2009).
[35] D. Zaev. On the Monge-Kantorovich problem with additional linear constraints. *Mathematical Notes.*, November 2015, Volume 98, Issue 5, pp 725-741.